

Response to Public Comments

Comment #1

Alan Hirsch, Transportation Committee Public Hearing Comment, 10/5/2023

I remain concerned that this plan does not address the transformational change we need in transportation planning. We continue to widen freeways, adds more cars on the road and which just re-congests. Polls show that 60% of Americans know that we can't widen freeways to get out of congestion. This is wasteful money, wasteful spending. We should be investing more money on transit. I've been talking about this for 25 years. The SACOG board has been gerrymandered so it has small cities on the fringe that have over weight versus people in the urban core of our region so I know you like to have freeways. You think that's the only solution for your towns on the edges of the region and that's true, but we need to focus on getting people into transit and that's not happening. We haven't made the shift needed. Climate change is a crisis, Caltrans says that by the end of the century, the Capital Corridor line will be under water. A 6.9 feet of sea level rise. This plan does not reflect the transformational change our communities need. When you look back 40 years, when we have this crisis are you going to be part of the solution or are you doing the same old same old. Thanks for considering this, I know you're not gonna change it but this is what needs to be said. Thank you very much.

Response to Comment #1

Thank you for your comment. No changes have been made to the document at this time in response to the comment.

Comment #2

Jacqueline Kahrs, Caltrans Office of Federal Programming, 10/11/2023

Hi Miguel,

Thank you for the opportunity to review SACOG's draft 2023 MTIP Amendment #11. Please see my comments below and let me know if you have any questions or concerns. Please include these comments and SACOG's response to the comments in the final MTIP amendment documentation, in the public comments/participation section.

Section 1: Summary of Changes

1. In the Sponsor comments section, some projects indicate both the previous and new completion year, while some projects only indicate the new completion year. Please ensure consistency.
2. ID# ELD19180 – Should it read “Increase PA&ED in FFY 2024...” instead of FFY 2014?
3. ID# ELD19345 –
 - a. Please clarify if this is a scope change.
 - b. Please confirm if this statement is intended to refer to FFY 2021: “Updated amounts in FFY 2011”
 - c. Please confirm if this statement is correct, or if it should list three different fiscal years: “added Future Unfunded Need lines in FFY 2027, 2027,
4. ID# PLA25873 – Please indicate that this is a new project being added to the MTIP.

5. Please consider changing reference to “Sacramento Regional Transit” instead of “RT.”
6. ID# YUB16093 – Please indicate this is a new project being added to the MTIP.

Section 2: Financial Summary

1. Please confirm the Highway Bridge Program (HBP) Revenues for the following years: For FY 2024 - \$11,401,350, FY 2025 - \$58,331,335, FY 2026 – \$41,818,136
2. Please confirm the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Revenues are correct and consistent with Caltrans HSIP listing dated March 15, 2023.

Response to Comment #2

Summary of Changes:

1. The Sponsor Comment section has been revised to provide consistency.
2. Yes, the comment has been revised to indicate FFY 2024.
3. The comment has been revised.
 - a. The changes are not a scope change
 - b. The date has been revised to FFY 2021
 - c. Future Unfunded Need to PS&E, ROW, and CON in FFY2027
4. The comment has been revised to indicate that this is a new project added to the MTIP.
5. The agency name has been revised to Sacramento Regional Transit
6. The comment has been revised to indicate that this is a new project added to the MTIP.

Financial Summary Comments:

1. Re: Revenue and Programmed Tables in the Financial Summary, we made changes to multiple bridges with funding years that needed updating to be consistent with the March 2023 HBP listing. We also made the changes to the financial tables accordingly.
2. Re: HSIP Programming, we made changes to multiple HSIP projects with funding years that needed updating to be consistent with the March 2023 listing. We also made the changes to the financial tables accordingly.

Comment #3

Sukhi Johal, Caltrans District 3 Regional Planning, 10/13/23

Dear Mr. Holtzen,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Notice of Availability of draft 2023 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), draft Amendment #11 to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), and Air Quality Conformity. Based on our reviews, we have provided the following comments.

Regional Transportation Planning Checklist:

1. In the Regional Transportation Planning (RTP) Checklist, please identify the page number for numbers 2, 3, 5, and 6 in the Modal Discussion section for the Final RTP checklist.

Air Quality Conformity Analysis Comments:

1. Please use the Conformity Analysis Documentation Checklist found in the 2017 RTP Guidelines, page 231. Currently, the 2005 version is used. Link to guidelines: <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/transportation-planning/documents/f0009312->

[2017rtpguidelinesformpos-a11y.pdf](#)

2. The PDF for the Conformity Analysis is titled June 6, 2006. Please update accordingly.
3. 93.115: This was not included in the 2005 version of the checklist; please address this using the checklist in the 2017 RTP guidelines (see comment above).
4. 93.102: Include the classification for Particular Matter (PM) 2.5 as moderate for Sacramento, Yolo, Solano, Placer, and El Dorado Counties.
5. 93.104 (b, c): Please remember to include the final version of the Board resolution when submitting the final conformity determination.
6. 93.109 (a, b): The Introduction on page 5 and Air Quality Emissions Analysis on page 11 may be included in the Conformity Analysis Documentation checklist as an error. Please confirm the page numbers.
7. 93.109 (c-k): We are unable to locate reference to the emissions budgets in the Air Quality Emissions Analysis section on page 11. We believe this information is mentioned on pages 2 and 13. Please confirm the page numbers.
8. 93.110 (a, b): Latest planning assumptions (page 7) refer to 2020 MTP/SCS. Please document that the use of latest planning assumption will be less than five years old.
9. 93.110 (a, b): Confirmation that the most recent vehicle registration data was used is required.
10. 93.110 (c, d, e, f): Please confirm if there have been any changes in transit operating policies and ridership levels since the previous conformity determination. Page 8 references 2020 MTP update; Transit fares also reference the 2020 MTP; please update page 101.
11. 93.118 (a, c, e): Please confirm if Table 6 should also be included in the conformity documentation checklist.
12. 93.118 (b): Please confirm if table #2 in Appendix C is an error.
13. 93.119 (h, i): Please confirm the accuracy of page numbers. Unable to locate discussion of baseline scenarios.
14. 93.122 (a, 1): Please document that the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) for non-regionally significant Federal projects is accounted for in the regional emissions analysis.
15. 93.122 (b)(1)(vi): Please indicate the specific page number and paragraph where transit and zone-to-zone impedances are discussed.
16. Conformity Approach on page 6 states the Board approved the last conformity determination on September 15, 2023. Please confirm accuracy.
17. 93.108: The fiscal constraint portion refers to the 2020 MTP; FHWA may require further clarification about fiscal constraint and how it relates to the 2020 MTP/SCS (page 7).

Response to Comment #3

Regional Transportation Planning Checklist:

1. The Regional Transportation Plan will identify the page number for numbers 2, 3, 5, and 6 in the Modal Discussion section for the Final RTP checklist.

Air Quality Conformity Analysis Document:

1. The checklist has been updated to the 2017 version.
2. The date has been updated.
3. 93.115 is not applicable to this analysis.
4. 'Moderate' has been added into the Introduction section.
5. The final board resolution will be included in the submittal.
6. Page numbers confirmed. No changes.

7. Page numbers confirmed.
8. Per 93.110 A – the assumptions used for this analysis were approved by the Regional Planning Partnership on 5/24/23. The date of 1/26/22 has been revised. The 2020 MTP is not the intended reference in this section.
9. See “Latest Planning Assumptions” page 7, “Latest Emissions Model” page 9 and Appendix C Table 7. EMFAC is developed by CARB which contains this detail.
10. The last conformity determination was made on 12/16/22 and there have not been any changes in operating policies and ridership
11. Documentation checklist has been revised to include both Table 6a and b.
12. Checklist corrected. Table 2 Appendix C clarified.
13. Please see section Analysis Techniques for scenario discussion. Checklist updated with correct page numbers.
14. A reference to “Modeling Documentation” has been included on the checklist.
15. The section “Modeling Documentation” describes the complexity of our SACSIM model. Transit and zone-to-zone impedances can be inferred from page 10 full paragraph 2 in the description of link and node and represented systems.
16. The date has been revised to state September 15, 2022.
17. The document is revised to refer to the 2023 MTP. The fiscal constraint should have referred to the 2023 MTP.